

REMARKS

Claims 12-28 and 32 are presented for consideration. Claims 12-17, 19, 22, 24, and 28 are currently amended. Claim 32 is new. Claims 1-11 and 29-31 were previously withdrawn from consideration. No claim is cancelled.

Firstly, Applicants respectfully point out that Applicants filed an RCE with a 3-month suspension of action on September 6, 2006. Nonetheless, an Office Action was filed November 22, 2006. Applicants contacted Examiner Sargon, and explained that Applicants intended to file a preliminary amendment prior to the expiration of the 3-month suspension of action, and that it was inappropriate for the USPTO to have issued an Office Action prior to the suspension of action period.

Further in the interview with Examiner Sargon, key features of the present invention were discussed. Examiner Sargon suggested that the term "activity" was too general, and that he was interpreting it to mean any printer-related activity, such as printing to an envelope. Applicants noted that the actual wording in the claims is "independent activities", and that printing to an envelope is part of a printer driver function, and that all printer driver functions are naturally related such that they are not independent of each other. Examiner Sargon suggested changing the term "activity" or "activities" to the term "program" or "programs" to better embody the actual invention. To remove any unintended ambiguity, Applicants have changed all occurrences of the terms "independent activity" or "independent activities" to "independent program" or "independent programs", as appropriate. Claims 12-17, 19, 22, 24, and 28 are currently amended to reflect these changes.

Although the term "program" is not explicitly used in the specification, it is explained at least on page 8, line 28-30 that the activities are stand-alone applications independent of each other. Examples of such stand alone applications are given at least on page 8, line 33 through page 9, line 34, and includes examples such as photo editing, greeting card creation, etc. As it would be understood in the art, such a stand-alone application may be termed as a computer "program".

Although Applicants believe that the Office Action issued on November 22, 2006 is inappropriate, Applicants will nonetheless address it in an effort to move forward prosecution of the present application.

The Office Action of November 22 rejects claims 12-28 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Chang et al., U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0097419A1. Applicants respectfully point out that the U.S. filing date of the present invention application (October 19, 2001) predates the U.S. filing date of Pub. No. 2002/0097419A1 (January 18, 2002). Applicants further point to MPEP 2136.03, Section I, Foreign Priority Date, which explains that, "Foreign application's filing dates that are claimed ... in applications, which have been published ...may not be used as 35 U.S.C. §102(e) dates for prior art purposes". Applicants therefore respectfully put forth that U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0097419A1 is inappropriate prior art.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Rosalio Haro/
Rosalio Haro
Registration No. 42,633

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.
Intellectual Property Department
2580 Orchard Parkway, Suite 225
San Jose, CA 95131
Phone: (408) 952-6131
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058
Customer No. 20178

Date: December 6, 2006